

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/865,579	Applicant(s) TAYA ET AL	
	Examiner Juliet C. Switzer	Art Unit 1634	

All Participants:
Status of Application: RCE

 (1) Juliet C. Switzer

(3) ____

 (2) Ping Wang

(4) ____

Date of Interview: 15 December 2004
Time: afternoon
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Amendments to the claims that would place the claims in condition for allowance were discussed. Ping Wang indicated that she would suggest the amendments to her client and contact the examiner. It was agreed that contact would be made with the examiner by Wednesday Dec. 22.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/865,579	TAYA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Juliet C. Switzer	1634	

All Participants:

Status of Application: first action RCE

(1) Juliet C. Switzer.

(3) _____.

(2) Chris Raymond (47258).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 December 2004

Time: afternoon

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

9.

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: An amendment to the claims was faxed in this application in the morning of 12/22/04 submitting amendments discussed in a previous interview between Ex. Switzer and Ping Wang (see interview summary 12/15/04). A courtesy copy was faxed to the examiner. The examiner noticed that additional amendments were needed to place the claims in condition for allowance. Namely in claim 9 to delete the language "of the RNA derived from the mecA gene or MRSA" from both part (a) of the claim and part (b) of the claim. Further, in part (b) of the claim, the third line of part (b) the phrase "the target" was amended to read "said target." Mr. Raymond approved the further amendments. It was also agreed that an examiner's amendment would be set forth which included all of the claims in their final form, thus including the amendments that were faxed 12/22/04 and the amendments discussed in this interview. .